(2)

No. 01-1367

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR [illegible]
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of The United States

Dan Barnett

Petitioner,

v.

Denver Publishing Company d/b/a
Rocky Mountain News, Inc.

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Supreme Court
Case from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado
Case No. 01SC620
Case from the Appeals Court for the State of Colorado
Case No. 00CA0642
From the District Court, Arapahoe County
Case No. 99CV391

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Dan Barnett
6565 South Syracuse Way , Suite 404
Englewood, CO 80111
303 796-9687

To Obtain A Copy Of This Brief Or A Digital File, Please Contact
www.networkdocumentservices.com (303) 534-6691

2 pp

1. With reference to Rule 15.8 regarding new information not available when the Extraordinary Writ of Certiorari was filed, the Petitioner would like to bring attention to Federal Civil Case 01-MK-2533 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO. Within briefs of the DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY, the Assistant Attorney General for the State of Colorado, Richard L. Webb, 029650* Litigation Section 1525 Sherman Street, 5th Floor Denver , Colorado 80203 (303) 866-3248 Fax (303) 866-5691, makes reference to the injunction. Page 2, Line 11 of these briefs states, "Notwithstanding that a plaintiff in proper jurisdiction might obtain some appropriate prospective injunctive relief." The Assistant Attorney General also within briefs uses the Rooker-Feldman Doctrine defense strategy and states that the United States Supreme Court is the only and proper jurisdiction for review for the injunction.

2. At this point in time the Assistant Attorney General has read the exhibits of the Supreme Court of the United States and is the only witness necessary by deposition or otherwise to prove Colorado statutes so that the Unites States Supreme Court can issue the mandatory, permanent, and immediate injunction and grant victory to the Petitioner.

3. The Respondent has waived its right to present other arguments for denying review, or any perceived misstatement of fact or law that are properly before the Court with a brief in opposition, by filing a waiver pursuant to Rule 15.2.

Dan Barnett

Dan Barnett